9/8/75

Dear Miss Stone,

I've been so busy that not hearing from you did not intrude upon my consciousness. I'm trying to get another book ready for printing, one that will be important to you. Someone is due here shortly, I'm regularly interrupted by phone, so if any of this is unclear please let me know.

In my view the executive sessions of the Warren Commission that I have are not only unique, important as that can be. They will never again be duplicated. My view is that Presidents use their commissions for special political purposes and that they will never again make the mistake of permitting a situation in which an investigatory devil loving truth will be able to get copies. (I've just filed suit for the last of those still withheld.)

If you can agree with this assumption, whether or not there is another case, then I think you can understand the importance I attach to these transcripts and their potential as a book, not just a thesis. And to preserving an interest.

There have been other interruptions so let me try to get to what I think is most important. I think you should read the few dependable, basic works first to be able to get more meaning from what you read of the official case. Unless you have had experience in evaluating material of this sory without having the benefit of the holes others have punched you may miss much and would then have to backtrack.

Sylvia 's book is great, you were wise to xerox it, but the index is not all-inclusive. Except for the current and hard-to-get Presumed Guilty by Howard Roffman (Fairleigh Dickinson Univ. Press) I don't think the other books are woth the time.

I can, of course, given you an estimate of the content of these hearings sessions almost all of which I now have. However, I'd prefer that you reach your own conclusions from reading them. I would think that any faculty would regard any scholarly examination of what is without precedent is the basis of a unique thesis. To help make this easy for them to understand, add this: that they were in such secrecy no members of the staff other than the chief honcho, the guy who really ran the Commission, was permitted to be present and at two points I can recall the embers were assured nobody would ever know. (After printing Whitewash IV I got another transcript in which they actually agree to Dulles' recommendation that they destroy the record. They slipped up on the stenotypists tape. I have a record of the destriction.)

I am faitly confident you'll draw the conclusions I have, but I also believe they should be your beliefs, not mine. What can make this more effective i s going farthur than I did in Whitewash IV, comparing the secret decisions with the practise.

I really think that well done it can be a best-seller as a book, with years of sales ahead as students use it in studies.

(At some time in the future I'd like to talk to your uncle's law partner. I'm accumulating more of that kind of data and it would eliminate any problem he might feel of conflict of interest.)

What you can do with this is one of the reasons I've always hoped for foundation support, so more students can carry forward while I'm alive and can help some of the many projects I've started and had to lay aside.

I do not think that there are many places in the Whitewash books at which I do not refer to the printed sources, almost all official. So, you can, I think, more profitably check me out this way and learn more about the Commission and its work. Most of the material in its files and that if printed really is not releveant. The key to understanding the overall is this, that the Commission began with a preconception, from whatever motive, and then did what it could to make it appear credible.

If you want further answers, ask. The currently heavier pressures will ease off. I think perhaps a good approach would be to get a tentative ok and then read this once in haste and then discuss it with your faculty people. Best regards. Harold Weisberg